

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-15 are pending and stand rejected.

Rejection of Claims 1-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, at item 4, claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ono et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0026241, hereafter referred to as "Ono") in view of Terry (U.S. Patent No. 7,006,481).

This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a router device, and recites:

... a route judgment section for judging ... the base station as a transfer destination ... in a case of the connection information acquired ... indicating the base station is connectable with the router device, and judging a transfer destination by looking up the routing table in a case of the router not acquiring the connection information.

That is, the routing judgment section judges the base station as the transfer destination when connection information is indicative of a base station that is connectable with the router device and judges a transfer destination by looking up the routing table in a case of the router not acquiring the connection information.

Ono Reference

Ono is directed to a packet transfer method. Ono discloses that routing information may be updated when necessitated by alteration of a network configuration (see Ono at paragraph [0263]) and that routing is based on the VCOA (virtual care of address) of terminal 3A (see Ono at paragraphs [0388]-[0392]). More particularly, Ono discloses that if the packet received by EN 1 is not a multicast packet (step D3, see Ono at paragraph [0346]) and the received packet does not have a prefix part (higher order 64 bits) that matches the address of the EN itself (e.g., the destination address is not in the same domain as EN1), the packet is transferred towards the VHA 10 and the EN 1 issues a cache request (in a BR-M3 message) to VHA 10. The VHA 10 of Ono then transfers the received packet to the VCOA and the VHA 10 issues a cache

report message destined for EN 1. For subsequent user packets destined for terminal 3a, EN 1 can encapsulate these packets with the VCOA and can transfer the user packets without passing VHA 10. (See Ono at paragraph [0391].)

As acknowledged by the Examiner at page 3 of the Office Action, Ono does not expressly disclose that "the router acquires connection information sent from the base station indicating the base station is connectable with the router device." Applicants agree with the Examiner's acknowledgment because Ono does not contemplate connection information or the use of such connection information in judgment regarding transfer destinations. As such, in the portions of Ono cited by the Examiner, Ono is silent regarding the judgment feature (i.e., "... judging ... the base station as a transfer destination ... in a case of the connection information acquired ... indicating the base station is connectable with the router device, and judging a transfer destination by looking up the routing table in a case of the router not acquiring the connection information,") as required by claim 1. More particularly, Ono does not disclose or suggest the claimed judgments being based on different conditions (i.e., a first condition in which the connection information acquired indicates the base station is connectable) and a second condition (in which the connection information is not acquired). That is, Ono is silent, for example, regarding connection information of the VCOA (e.g., EN4 in Fig. 19) and, furthermore, the use of such connection information as conditions for routing to the base station or for routing based on a routing table look up.

Terry Reference

Terry, at the portion cited by the Examiner, discloses that upon detection by the integrated terminal 220 of the 802.11 association or re-association procedure, the integrated terminal 220 establishes a 3G connection and a radio bearer between the terminal 220 and the UTRAN 225. That is, Terry teaches that upon detection of a procedure (association or re-association) a 3G connection is established. Terry also does not contemplate judgment that the base station is the transfer destination based on a first condition (i.e., that the connection information acquired indicates the base station is connectable) and judgment of the transfer destination by look up in a routing table based on a second condition (i.e., that the connection information is not acquired). This is because, for example, Terry does not contemplate different judgments for a transfer destination based on connection information.

Thus, the combination of Ono and Terry does not teach the use of acquired connection information to either establish the base station as the transfer destination or determine the transfer destination by lookup in the routing table.

Accordingly, claim 1 is submitted to patentably distinguish over Ono in view of Terry for at least the above-mentioned reasons.

Claims 3, 6-10 and 15

Claims 3, 6-10 and 15, which include similar but not identical features to those of claim 1, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Ono in view of Terry for at least similar reasons to those of claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-5, 11-14

Claims 2, 4-5 and 11-14, which include all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 3, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Ono in view of Terry for at least the same reasons as claim 1 or claim 3.

Conclusion

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

EB/nm

Dated: May 15, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM410800